(1)

Supreme Court, U.S.
FILED

00 728 OCT - 4 2000

OFFICE OF THE CLERK

No:

In The

Supreme Court of the United States

Joseph C. Miechowicz

Petitioner,

vs.

The State of New Jersey,

Respondent.

On Petition For Writ of Certiorari,
To The Supreme Court for;
The State of New Jersey,

Petition for Writ of Certiorari,
Rule # 14

From:
Mr. Joseph C. Miechowicz
Pro-se Litigant,
9852 W. Katella Ave. #514
Anaheim, Ca. 92804
(714)-570-6688,

Questions Presented

1) The first question that the Petitioner wishes to present to the Court, is weather or not the Petitioner's Petition for Post Conviction Relief, 1st Amended Petition is timely as pursuant to the provisions of; **Mun. Pract. Rule # 7:10-2(b)-2**. When the Petitioner filed the 1st Amended Petition on March 25, 1999, in the Municipal Court for; Monroe Township, N.J., docket **# 84-T9207,** and is within a year of when the State of New Jersey Department of Vehicles obtained a civil judgment in the Superior Court for; Mercer County, N.J., docket **# 98-62698,** on May 05, 1998.

2) The second question for review is did the State of New Jersey violate the Petitioners rights under the **14th Amendment** to the **U.S. Constitution** when the Grand Jury Hearing of Middlesex County, N.J., on April 26, 1984, **file # 83-121905,** chose to render a judgment not to prosecute the Petitioner for committal of Aggravated Assault, **2C:12-1(b),** for the incident of Dec. 06, 1983, since the State of New Jersey no billed the indictment against the brother Edward Miechowicz, under the same docket **# 83-121905.**

3) The third question for review, is did the State of New Jersey violate the petitioner's rights under the **14th, and 8th Amendments** to the U.S. Constitution, for placing the Petitioner in custody of a secret investigation for an unspecified term, for the committal of Aggravated Assault, **2C:12-1(b),** in the Grand Hearing of Middlesex County, N.J., on April 26th, 1984, File No: **83-121905.**

4) The fourth question for review, is did the State of New Jersey violate the Petitioner's rights under **the 8th Amendment** to the **U.S. Constitution**, on the grounds that during the secret Grand Jury Investigation, the Respondent operated outside of their discretionary function when the Respondent chose operate the secret Grand Jury Investigation outside of the guidelines setforthe in "Conduct of Intelligence Activities", through **Title 50 U.S.C. § 401 Executive Order No: 12333, Part 2.**

5) The fifth question for review, is did the State of New Jersey violate the Petitioner's rights under the **8th Amendment** to the **U.S. Constitution**, on the grounds that the Respondent operated outside their discretionary function when the Respondent chose to keep females away from the Petitioner for reasons other than his possible violent behavior, and basically used sex against the Petitioner.

Table of Contents

	Page
Questions Presented	1
Table on Contents	3
List of Parties	4
Table of Authorities	4
Opinions Below	4
Statement of Jurisdiction	6
Table of Laws	7
Statement of the Case	8
Argument	11
Granting the Writ	15
Conclusion	16

Appendix

	Page
Grand Jury Hearing	17
D.W.I. Offenses	18 - 19
N.J.-D.M.V. Judgements	20
Municipal Court Ruling	21
Superior Court Ruling	22
Appellate Ruling	23
N.J. Supreme Court Ruling	24

List of Parties

The Respondent,
The Prosecutor's Office for;
Middlesex County, N.J.,
1 J.F.K. Square,
P.O. Box 0071
New Brunswick, N.J., 08903,
(732)-745-3300

Table of Authorities

	Page
N.J. vs. Carlos, A-3186-80T4, Superior Court, Appellate Division, 187 N.J. Super. 406,; 455 A.2d 89; 1982 N.J. Super. LEXIS 979,	12

Opinions Below:

On April 26th, 1984 the Grand Jury Hearing, of Middlesex County, N.J., File No: **83-121905** no billed the indictment against the brother, Edward Miechowicz, for the charge of Aggravated Assault, **N.J.S.A. § 2C:12-1(b),** for the shooting incident of Dec. 06, 1983, and rendered a judgement not to prosecute the Petitioner.

On Sept. 02, 1984, the Petitioner committed his 2nd D.W.I. offense, **N.J.S.A. § 39:4-50(a)-2** in the Municipal Court of East Brunswick, N.J., docket **# 84-F6626,** and on Oct. 10, 1984 the Petitioner committed his 3rd D.W.I., offense**, N.J.S.A. § 39:4-50(a)-3,** in the Municipal Court of Monroe Township, N.J., docket **# 84-T9207,** and found to be guilty of these offenses, the Petitioner was sentenced pursuant to the guidelines, along with the insurance surcharges of $6,000.00.

On, May 05, 1998, The State of New Jersey, Department of Motor Vehicles, obtained a civil judgment in the Superior Court for Mercer County, N.J., docket **# 98-62698** as pursuant to the provisions of; **N.J.S.A. § 17:29A-35(a)-3(c).**

On Feb. 05, 1999 the Petitioner filed a Petition for Post Conviction, butt due to some mistakes in the petition, the Petitioner chose to file another petition, a 1st Amended Petition, on March 25, 1999, in the Municipal Court of Monroe Township, N.J., docket **# 84-T9207,** to reverse the 3rd D.W.I., conviction judgement, in which would remove the financial liability of the insurance surcharges. On March 26, 1999, the Municipal Court for Monroe Township issued an order, denying the Petitioner's petition. The Petitioner also filed a Petition for Post Conviction Relief, on Feb. 05, 1999, and a 1st Amended Petition on March 25, 1999, with the Municipal Court of East Brunswick, N.J., **docket # 84-F6626.** On Sept. 01, 1999, the Municipal Court for East Brunswick, N.J., issued an Order, denying the Petitioner's petition. The Petitioner states that due to the fact that the Petitioner's financial situation was was/is quite inadequate and the Petitioner could not afford litigating both Appeals at the sametime.

On April 15, 1999, the Petitioner filed a Notice of Appeal, with the Superior Court for Middlesex County, N.J., Municipal Appeal, docket **# 72-99,** and on July 23, 1999 the Superior Court issued a one page document outlining the Superior Court's findings. Then on August 05, 1999, the Superior Court issued a signed order dismissing the Municipal Appeal.

On, Dec 14, 1999, the Petitioner filed a Notice of Appeal, with the Superior Court for N.J., Appellate Division, **docket # 2271-99T2,** and on Feb. 15 2000, filed and order dismissing the appeal, without explaination.

On, March 15, 2000, the Petitioner filed a the Notice of Appeal, with the Supreme Court for the State of New Jersey, docket **# 49,430,** and do to procedure mistakes by the Petitioner the judgment of the Appeal was delayed for a few months. The Petitioner states that on July 31, 2000, the Supreme Court for the

State of New Jersey, issued a final judgement, dismissing the Appeal.

Statement of Jurisdiction

The judgement of the Supreme Court for the State of New Jersey, was entered on July 31, 2000. The jurisdiction of this Court is invoked pursuant to; **Title 28 U.S.C. § 1257(a).**

Table of Laws

	Page
14th Amendment	1, 11, 15
11th Amendment	10
8th Amendment	1, 2, 14
Title 28 U.S.C. § 1257(a)	6
Title 50 U.S.C. § 401	1, 13, 14
N.J.S.A. § 2C:12-1(b)	1, 4, 9, 12, 15
N.J.S.A. § 17:29A-35(a)	5
N.J.S.A. § 30:9-12.20	9, 12, 13
N.J.S.A. § 39:4-50(a)	4, 9, 15
N.J. Court Rule 7:10-2(b)-2	1, 11
N.J. Court Rule 7:10-2(c)-1	11

Statement of the Case

The Petitioner states to the Court that this case comes from an insanely violent incident, that happened on Dec. 06, 1983, in the borough of Jamesburg, N.J., in which the Petitioner while fully intoxicated with alcohol, the Petitioner charged at his brother Edward, with a machete, and the brother, Edward armed with a 22 caliber rifle shot the Petitioner in the chest. Since law enforcement did not know that the shooting was in self defense, my brother was arrested for attempted murder, and the charges were lessened only when it was found that the Petitioner was going to survive. The Petitioner states to hear the charge of Aggravated Assault against the brother Edward, there was a Grand Jury Hearing, in New Brunswick, in Middlesex County, N.J., on April 26th, 1984, File No: **83-121905**, and in this Grand Jury Hearing, the Petitioner confessed to "lunging at his brother with the machete". The Petitioner states to the Court that once the Grand Jury realized that the shooting incident was in self defense, then the Grand Jury no billed the indictment and dropped all charges against my brother, Edward. The Petitioner states to the Court that since the Grand Jury dropped the charges against the brother Edward, then aggressor could only be the Petitioner and the Respondent should have prosecuted the Petitioner for Aggravated Assault, butt there was no prosecution.

The Petitioner states to the Court that the Petitioner was a well known acute alcoholic many years prior to the violent incident of Dec. 06 1983, and the Respondent could have easy known about this acute alcoholism if they would have done their job. The Petitioner states to the Court that the Respondent could have checked the Petitioners coworkers, neighbors, and high school classmates, and they would have told the Respondent that the Petitioner was clearly an acute alcoholic in need of some sort of State of New Jersey intervention. The Petitioner states that the Respondent should have prosecuted the Petitioner for the violent incident of Dec. 06, 1983, or Aggravated Assault, **N.J. S.A. §**

2C:12-1(b), in which would have allowed a Superior Court Judge to sentence the Petitioner to an alcohol rehabilitation hospital pursuant to the provisions of; N.J. Institution and Agencies Code; **N.J.S.A. § 30:9-12.20,** and since the Respondent did not do so, the Petitioner alleges that the Respondent is negligent.

The Petitioner states that since there was no intervention by the State of New Jersey, the Petitioner continued to consume alcohol unabated and 5 months later from the Grand Jury Hearing of April 26th, 1984, the Petitioner committed his 2nd Driving While under the Influence offense, **N.J.S.A. § 39:4-50(a)-2,** on Sept. 02, 1984, in East Brunswick, N.J., docket **# 84-F6626,** and the 3rd Driving While under the Influence offense; **N.J.S.A. § 39:4-50(a)-3,** on Oct. 10, 1984, in Monroe Township, N.J., docket **# 84-T9207.** The Petitioner states that with the sentence of the 3rd D.W.I., the Petitioner was ordered to an alcohol rehabilitation hospital for 28 days, at Turning Point, in Verona, N.J., and the Petitioner has not to this date committed any alcohol or violence related violations of law. The Petitioner states that this basically proves to the Court that is if the Petitioner received some sorta State intervention, for the incident of Dec. 06, 1983, the Petitioner would not have committed the 2nd and 3rd Driving While under the Influence offenses.

The Petitioner states that after the Petitioner sobered up, the Petitioner realized the negligence by the Respondent and do to reasons stated in the Exhibit of Evidence; A, which is the Petition for Post Conviction Relief. The Petitioner will not explain what happened to the Petitioner from 1985 to the present, as this has been already done in the Exhibit of Evidence; A.

The Petitioner would like to briefly describe the litigation of 1993, 1994 and 1995. The Petitioner states that once the Petitioner realized that he was being secretly investigated, the Petitioner tried to stop the investigation through a civil lawsuit against the State of New Jersey, in **J.C.M. vs. N.J.** docket **# 93-518,** in the U.S. District Court for the Central District for California, on May 07, 1993, and after the Petitioner was ordered

to serve the summons and complaint, the Petitioner actually tried to stop the investigation with a Temporary Restraining Order, although the District Court did not allow the Petitioner's T.R.O., to be heard. The Petitioner took the U.S. District Court's denial of the T.R.O. hearing to the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals, on Dec. 02, 1993 through a Writ of Mandamus, docket **# 93-70953** and moved the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals to order the U.S. District Court to entertain the Petitioner's request for a Temporary Restraining Order butt the Writ of Mandamus, was denied on Dec. 08, 1993. The Petitioner continued to litigate the Action at Law, until, July 05, 1994, when the petitioner filed a Voluntary Dismissal with the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals, docket **# 93-70953,** on the grounds that the Action at Law violated the State of New Jersey rights under the **11th Amendment** to the **U.S. Constitution.** The Petitioner, since not truely understanding the legal system, the Petitioner filed a "Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus", against the United States of America, in **J.C.M. vs. U.S.A.** docket **# 94-1000,** also in the U.S. District Court for the Central District for California, on Nov. 14, 1994, and the Petitioner continued the ill fated Action at Law, until, Oct. 12, 1995, when the Petitioner's Application for an Extension of Time, **No: A-326,** to Justice, Ms. Sandra Day O'Connor, to appeal Action at Law, docket **# 94-56787,** from the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals, to the U.S. Supreme Court, was denied.

During the month of November, 1994, the Petitioner met his x wife, Martha, and that this basically stopped the Petitioner from litigating, on the grounds that the Petitioner only wanted to raise a family. Then on May 05, 1998, the State of New Jersey, Dept. of Motor Vehicles, filed civil judgement in the Superior Court for Mercer County, N.J., docket **# 98-62698,** for the sum of $6,000.00, for insurance surcharges from the 2nd and 3rd D.W.I's of 1984, and that this civil judgement is on the Petitioner 's nation wide credit report. The Petitioner states to the Court that this is what makes everything come back life legally, and brings the case to the Supreme Court of the United States of America.

Argument

1) The Petitioner states to the Court that the Superior Court's ruling in the Municipal Appeal, docket **# 72-99,** on August 5, 1999, in which the Court ruled that the Petition for Post Conviction Relief is denied as it was filed outside of the 5 year statute of limitations pursuant to **N.J. Court Rule 7:10-2(b)-2**, is an erroneous conclusion of law. The Petitioner states to the Court that the Petitioner informed the Superior Court, through filing of Petition for Post Conviction Relief where the Petitioner clearly stated in the section; "Grounds", in the Exhibit of Evidence; "A", pages 4 & 5, is the **14th Amendment** to the **U.S. Constitution** violation against the Petitioner by the Respondent thus, as stated in the **N.J. Court Rule # 7:10-2(c)-1**, the Petitioner has clearly shown a "substantial denial in the conviction proceedings of Defendant's rights under the Constitution of the U.S.", and this allegation makes the Petition for Post Conviction Relief cognizable in this Court or any court. The Petitioner would like to briefly explain why, the Petitioner did not assert the **14th Amendment** violation in the Municipal Court for; Monroe Township, N.J., docket **# 84-T9207,** on Jan. 24, 1985, which was that the Petitioner was too traumatized by the whole situation to litigate against the State of New Jersey. Then the Petitioner litigated against the State of New Jersey in the wrong court, the federal courts, and is bringing this Action at Law due to the fact that the State of New Jersey, Dept. of Motor Vehicles obtained a civil judgement in the Superior Court for; Mercer County, N.J., docket **# 98-62698,** on May 05, 1998, which basically brought everything back to life legally. The Petitioner would like to refer the Court to the Exhibit of Evidence; "A", Section; "N.J. Jurisdiction", pages 8 through 12, and the Section; "U.S. Attorney General Jurisdiction", pages 13 through 19, which fully explains the traumatic experience that caused the Petitioner not to litigate the **14th Amendment** violations in the Municipal Courts. The Petitioner states to the Court to the Exhibit of Evidence; "A", Section, "Bar of Grounds",

pages 5 through 7, which fully explains the reasons why the Petitioner litigated in the federal court system, and how this Action at Law comes before the Supreme Court for; The United States of America.

2) The Petitioner does hereby state that the second argument is weather or not the Petitioner should have been sentenced to an alcohol rehabilitation hospital pursuant to the provisions of; **N.J.S.A. § 30:9-12.20,** for the committal of Aggravated Assault, **N.J.S.A. § 2C:12-1(b).** The Petitioner would like to refer the Court case; State vs. Carlos, A-3186-80T4, Superior Court for N.J., Appellate Division, 187 N.J. Super. 406,; 455 A.2d 89; 1982 N.J. Super. LEXIS 979, Oct. 04, 1982, argued; Dec. 01, 1982, Decided, The Petitioner would like to briefly explain what happened in State vs. Carlos, A-3186-80T4, is that Mr. Glenn M. Carlos, entered John's Arco Station in Paterson, N.J., on Sept. 15, 1980, and committed 4 first degree robberies and 1 count of Aggravated Assault, and 1 attempted Aggravated Assault, and also was sentenced to an alcohol rehabilitation hospital. The Petitioner states to the Court that if the violent convicted criminal Mr. Glenn M Carlos, can be sentenced to an alcohol rehabilitation hospital than so should the Petitioner for his committal of Aggravated Assualt.

The Petitioner would like to refer the Court to the Exhibit of Evidence; "B", Section "N.J. Incidents", page 6, which is a copy of a news report of an incident in East Brunswick, N.J., on August 15, 1982, in which a man named Ingmar Stegis, 25, was shot and killed by law enforcement after he jumped over a barricade and lunged at an officer with a machete. The Petitioner argues that if Mr. Stegis had to pay the ultimate price for his mental instability, and the Middlesex County Prosecutor's Office knew of the fact that Mr. Stegis paid the ultimate price for his mental instability, then they knew of the Petitioner's possible violent nature. The Respondent knew of the incident in East Brunswick, N.J., and should have processed the Petitioner for his alcoholism that caused the insanely violent incident of Dec. 06, 1983, in which the

Petitioner himself wielded a machete. The Petitioner refers the Court to the Exhibit of Evidence; "A", Sections; Rehabilitation and 14th Amendment, in which the Petitioner fully litigates these issues.

3) The Petitioner states to the Court that the third argument that the Petitioner presents to the Court is weather or not the Petitioner has been sentenced to be secretly investigated from the Grand Jury Hearing of Middlesex County, N.J., on April 26 1984, File No: **83-121905** for the Committal of Aggravated Assault, on Dec. 06, 1983, in Jamesburg, N.J., The Petitioner refers the Court to the Exh. of Evidence; "A", in Section; "Evidence of the Investigation", pages 20 through 26, which clearly explains that some other legal process must be operating to allow the Petitioner to not be processed for his illegal obtained driving privileges, and that this Section fully litigates this legal theory. The Petitioner would also like the Court to consider the fact that the News Media either does not wish or can not air the story, and refers the Court to the Exhibit of Evidence "A", in the Section; "National Security Issues",, pages 27 through 49, and to the 'Exhibit of Evidence; "D", Section; "The 50% Female Senate", pages 44, through 60, in which are the two Historical Papers written by the Petitioner, and should have been aired immedately by the News Media. The Petitioner would also like to refer the Court to the Exhibit of Evidence "D", Section, "Skokie, Illinois, on pages 24 and 25, and the Court can read more of the Petitioner's litigation on why the story should be aired and which also proves that a court order must be keeping the story secret.

4) Since the Respondent operated a secret investigation against the Petitioner, and that this secret investigation connects to National Security, through the fact that the only guidelines for a secret investigation are in the Laws of National Security, through **Title 50 U.S.C. § 401, Exe. Ord. 12333, Part 2**, "Conduct for Intelligence Activities", and through the employment at Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, and that the guidelines for the secret investigation have been totally disregarded, only for the sole

purpose to keep the illegal activities secret, a violation of; **Title 50 U.S.C. § 401, Exe. Ord. 12356, Section 1.6(a),** "Limitations on Classifications", and the **8th Amendment** to the **U.S. Constitution.** The Petitioner refers the Exhibit of Evidence; "A", the Section; "National Security Issues", pages 27 through 49, in which fully litigates the situation. The Petitioner feels that the only correct counter measure to be implemented is the making of the guidelines stated in **Title 50 U.S.C. § 401, Exe. Ord. 12333, Part 2**, to be a Federal Statute, and that all secret investigations should have time limitations.

5) Since the Respondent, and the Federal Government kept women away from the Petitioner, illegally for an illegal purpose which is to break the Petitioner pyschologically, and that this form of punishment administered by the same gender government, for the committal of Aggravated Assault, is clearly a violation of the **8th Amendment** to the **U.S. Constitution,** and **Title 50 U.S.C. § 401, Exe. Ord. 12333, Part 2,.** The Petitioner feels that the only correct counter measure to be implemented is the making of the **U.S. Senate, U.S. Military,** and the **U.S. Supreme Court** to be **50% Female** to fully represent the **50% Female Population.** The Petitioner refers the Court to the Exhibit of Evidence; "A", Section; "National Security Issues", pages 27 through 49, and to the Exhibit of Evidence; "D", Section; "The 50% Female Senate", pages 44, through 60, in which fully litigates the situation.

The Petitioner would also like to state to the Court that the Petitioner has included the "Presentation of Claims, Exhibit of Evidence; "C". The Petitioner explains that what is included in the Exhibit of Evidence; "C", is all the trauma that the Petitioner went through during the 16.5 year long secret Grand Jury Investigation, and is an important Exhibit of Evidence for the Court to take under consideration. The Petitioner states to the Court that all four of the Exhibits of Evidence; A, B, C, & D, are just as important to the Action at Law is as the actual Petition for Writ of Certiorari.

Granting the Writ,

The Judgement of the Supreme Court for the State of New Jersey, should be reviewed by this Court, on the grounds that;

A) The Petitioner's Petition for Post Conviction Relief, was timely, on the grounds that the State of New Jersey initiated litigation against the Petitioner on May 05, 1998, through a civil judgement in the Superior Court for Mercer County, N.J., docket # **98-62698,** and the Petitioner filed his Petition for Post Conviction Relief, on Feb 05, 1999, and the 1st Amended Petition, on March 25, 1999, in the Municipal Court for; Monroe Township, N.J., docket **# 84-T9207.**

B) That the State of New Jersey, violated the Petitioners rights under the **14th Amendment** to the **U.S. Constitution**, which is that the two sentences combined for the committal of 2nd and 3rd D.W.I. offenses, **N.J.S.A. § 39:4-50(a)-2 &-3,** are greater than the single first offense of Aggravated Assault, **N.J.S.A. § 2C:12-1(b),** and that the end result of either conviction would have included the sentence of an alcohol rehabilitation hospital, pursuant to the provisions of; **N.J.S.A. § 30:9-12.20.**

Conclusion

The Petitioner states to the Court, for the foregoing reasons, the Petitioner Respectfully prays that its; Petition for a Writ of Certiorari be granted.

Respectfully Submitted;

Dated; Nov. 02, 2000,

Signed; Joseph C. Miechowicz,

Mr. Joseph C. Miechowicz,
Pro-se Litigant,
9852 W. Katella Ave. #514
Anaheim, Calif. 92804,
(714)-570-6688, pgr. & v-mail.

The Superior Court for;

Middlesex County, N.J.,

State of New Jersey,	)	Case No: **83-121905**
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	Complaint No: W81219,
	)	W81220, & W81221.
vs.	)	
	)	
Edward Miechowicz,	)	
	)	
Defendant,	)	
	)	
	)	

The above-mentioned matter was presented to the Middlesex County Grand Jury, on; Thursday, April 26, 1984, and a No-Bill was returned.

Yours Very truly,
signed; s/ Al S. Rockoff
Middlesex County Prosecutor

The Municipal Court for;

Monroe Township, N.J.,

State of New Jersey	)	Case No: **84-T9207**
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	Charge of;
	)	N.J.S.A. § 39:4-50(a)-3
vs.	)	
	)	
Joseph C. Miechowicz,	)	
	)	
Defendant.	)	
	)	
	)	

With the Defendant's guilty plea, this Court finds the Defendant guilty as charged for the committal of N.J.S.A. § 39:4-50(a)-3, On Oct. 10, 1984, and this Court sentences the Defendant to the above mentioned statute on this date; Jan. 24, 1985.

Hon. Terrill Brenner
Municipal Judge,

The Municipal Court for;

East Brunswick, N.J.,

State of New Jersey,	)	Case No: **84-F6626**
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	Charge of;
	)	N.J.S.A. § 39:4-50(a)-2
vs.	)	
	)	
Joseph C. Miechowicz,	)	
	)	
Defendant.	)	
	)	
	)	

With the Defendant's guilty plea, this Court finds the Defendant guilty as charged for the committal of N.J.S.A. § 39:4-50(a)-2, P on Sept. 02, 1984, and this Court sentences the Defendant to the above mentioned statute on this date; Nov. 08, 1984.

Hon. James F. Hyland
Municipal Judge

The Superior Court for;

Mercer County, N.J.,

State of New Jersey,	)	Case No: **98-62698**
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	Civil Judgement,
vs.	)	
	)	N.J.S.A. § 17:29A-35
Joseph C. Miechowicz,	)	(a)-3(c)
	)	
Defendant	)	
	)	
	)	

With the Defendant's two convictions of Driving While under the Influence, N.J.S.A. § 39:4-50(a), This court orders the Defendant to pay the combined insurance surcharge amount of $6,000.00, plus interest and court costs, on this date; May 05, 1998.

Hon. N/A
Superior Court Judge

The Municipal Court for;

Monroe Township, N.J.,

State of New Jersey	)	Case No: **84-T9207**
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	3rd Offense D.W.I.
	)	
vs.	)	Post Conviction Relief,
	)	
Joseph C. Miechowicz,	)	Rule # 7:10-2(f)-3
	)	
Defendant.	)	
	)	
	)	

As noted, the Defendant is apparently attempting to vacate his guilty plea on that basis and on that theory. This Court is unable and unwilling to grant the relief requested. Defendant's motion is denied, on this date; March 26, 1999.

Hon. s/ George M. Boyd
George M. Boyd, Judge.

Hon. Glenn Berman,
Middlesex County Prosecutor,
1 J.F.K. Square,
New brunswick, N.J., 08903
(732) -745-3300,

The Superior Court for;

Middlesex County, N.J.,

State of New Jersey,	)	Appeal No: **72-99**
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	ORDER,
vs.	)	
	)	
Joseph C. Miechowicz,	)	
Defendant.	)	
	)	

This Matter, having been opened to the Court by the Defendant, on appeal from conviction of N.J.S.A. § 39:4-50(a)-3, in the Municipal Court of Monroe, It is on this 5th day of August, 1999, ORDERED, by the Court that the Appeal is hereby dismissed for failure to file in a timely manner.

Hon. s/ Barnette E. Hoffman,
Superior Court Judge,

FILED

Feb. 15, 2000

The Superior Court for N.J.,

Appellate Division,

State of New Jersey,	)	Case No: **A-2271-99T2**
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	Order;
vs.	)	
	)	
Joseph C. Miechowicz,	)	
	)	
Defendants.	)	
	)	
	)	

THIS MATTER: having been duly presented to the Court, it is on this 8th day, of February, 2000, hereby ordered as follows; DENIED for the Motions by Appellant, Proceed as Indigent, File Appeal Nunc Pro Tunc, For Further Relief, The Appeal is Dismissed.

Hon. s/ David S. Baime
P.J.A.D.

FILED

July 31, 2000

The Supreme Court for;

The State of New Jersey,

State of New Jersey,	)	Case No: **49,430**
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	ORDER:
vs.	)	
	)	
Joseph C. Miechowicz,	)	
	)	
Defendant,	)	
	)	
	)	

It is ORDERED: that the Petition for Certification is denied, and it is further; ORDERED; that the appeal filed in the within matter is dismissed pursuant to Rule 2:12-9. It is also ORDERED; that the Motions; to Proceed as Indigent, and for Leave to File a Notice for Certification are GRANTED, Motions for Acceleration and Stay are dismissed.

s/ Stephen W. Townsend
Clerk.